

## REMARKS

The present application was filed on April 16, 2004 with claims 1 through 20. Claims 1 through 20 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application. Independent claims 1, 6, 9 and 14 are proposed to be amended herein. Claims 2, 3, 7, 8, 10 and 15 are proposed to be cancelled herein, without prejudice.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 9-12, 14-17, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Lahat et al. (United States Patent Number 6,417,944), in view of Tomioka (United States Patent Number 5,452,115). Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Soderberg et al. (United States Patent Number 7,349,629), in view of Lahat and further in view of Tomioka. Claims 5, 13 and 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### Independent Claims 1, 6, 9 and 14

Independent claims 1, 9 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lahat et al. in view of Tomioka and claim 6 was rejected under 35 U. S. C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Soderberg et al. in view of Lahat and in view of Tomioka. With respect to claims 1 and 14, for example, the Examiner asserts that Tomioka discloses synchronizing a transmission and reception of a message such that a message sent in a transmitting time-slot  $k$  by a node  $N_i$  is received by a node  $N_j$  in a receiving time-slot  $k$ .

Each independent claim has been amended to emphasize that the synchronizing is performed by the hub node. Support for this amendment can be found, for example, in the original application in claim 3 and page 8, lines 20-22. Applicants submit that this feature is not shown or suggested by Lahat et al., Soderberg or Tomioka, alone or in any combination.

When rejecting claim 3, the Examiner asserts that Tomioka teaches that the synchronizing is performed by the hub node.

Applicants submit that Tomioka does not disclose or suggest that the synchronizing is performed by the hub node. In FIG. 2A of Tomioka, the communications clearly pass through central node 4, but slots are assigned by network controller (NWC) 3. See also, FIG. 6 and Col. 10, lines 23-59, where it is noted that the time slot allocation is performed by the NWC 3.

Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1,

6, 9 and 14.

Dependent Claims

Claims 4-5, 11-13 and 16-20 are dependent on independent claims 1, 9 and 14, and are therefore patentably distinguished over Lahat, Kalkunte et al., Soderberg et al. and Tomioka, alone or in any combination, because of their dependency from independent claims 1, 9 and 14 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim.

Conclusion

All of the pending claims following entry of the amendments are in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner has already indicated that Claims 5, 13 and 18 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin M. Mason  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 36,597  
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP  
1300 Post Road, Suite 205  
Fairfield, CT 06824  
(203) 255-6560

Date: May 1, 2009